



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

plete mastery and sober presentation of all the facts. The author's statement (page 112) that by 1837 no Northern states except Connecticut, New Jersey and Ohio retained any property restriction upon manhood suffrage, overlooks the fact that the New York constitution of 1821 and 1846 disfranchised all men of color not possessed of a freehold estate of the value of \$250. A less excusable error is the assertion that the Peace Congress of 1861 was "made up of delegates from all but the seceding states" (page 214); whereas neither Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California nor Oregon was represented there. We are also told that the processes of presidential reconstruction were complete in the autumn of 1865 "in every state except Texas" (page 259). The author might have learned from Johnson's message of December 18, 1865 (McPherson, *Reconstruction*, p. 67) that Florida also was still in a transition state.

Notwithstanding these and other mistakes, and in spite of an overwrought style and many almost bewildering refinements of adjectives and phrases, it is impossible to criticise the little volume without reluctance. The sincerity and uncommon ability which Professor Wilson shows are worthy a much more elaborate work. In fact, it seems to me that only in such an undertaking will he be able to do his talent full justice and perform his entire duty toward American history.

FREDERIC BANCROFT.

History of the English Parliament, together with an account of the Parliaments of Scotland and Ireland. By G. BARNETT SMITH. London, Ward, Lock, Bowden & Co., 1892.—Two volumes, 1167 pp.

The author states that his is the first full and consecutive history of Parliament as a legislative institution from the earliest times to the present day. Many years have been occupied in collecting the material and writing the book. It was the plan of the author to give in foot-notes a complete list of the references upon which his various statements are based. But to do this, we are told, would occupy as much space as the text of the book. That is, there would have been four volumes instead of two. As published, little space is occupied with foot-notes. A chapter is devoted to the history of the parliament of Scotland, and another to the Irish legislature. Fac-similes of various documents appear in the book, such as the writ of Edward I directing the sheriffs of London to return two

members to Parliament, and the return of the assessor showing John Hampden and others as delinquents in the payment of ship money. The appendix contains *Magna Carta* and other documents.

Notwithstanding the author's statement that his book does not enter into comparison with the standard constitutional histories, the reader is sure constantly to make such comparisons. If the book had borne the name *Constitutional History* instead of *History of Parliament*, the reader would have detected little that was inconsistent with the title till he reached the account of legislation in the time of Victoria; and for the Victorian era there is not given a history of Parliament as a legislative body, but instead there is an account of the acts of Parliament classified under various heads. It is a constitutional history from a Parliamentary standpoint. Parliament is made prominent throughout, but there is no apparent effort to confine the narrative to the legislative functions of that body. Much care is taken to give a complete account of its judicial functions and to set forth its relations to the courts of law, while a large proportion of the space is devoted to a discussion of its relations to the king and the ministry. This is not a fault of the book. It is simply a fact growing out of the nature of the subject. The author is to be commended in that he has made no effort to discriminate sharply between the executive and the legislative functions of Parliament.

It is a serious fault of the book that the reader is left in doubt as to the authority upon which the various statements are based. If the work were simply a compilation from standard authors, this would not be a serious fault. But the book is not such a compilation. The author has made use of original sources of information. The standard authors are not simply quoted; in many instances they are corrected. Mr. Smith has evidently expressed in some cases his own opinions, yet there is no sign whereby these may be distinguished from the opinions of others. A reader who cares anything about authorities is not satisfied with the simple declaration in the preface that every statement in the book is based either upon official records or upon the conclusions of historians who have made themselves familiar with the subject. He wants to know just what the authority is. Especially does he want to distinguish between the author's own elaborations from official records and his quotations and paraphrases from standard histories. Many passages in the work are designed to give the impression that the

author apprehends more clearly than the standard authors whom he quotes so freely the fact that the free democratic constitution of England is exceedingly modern. He seems to have his eye upon the masses of the people and to wish to make it evident that these were not usually taken into the account in the balancing of the dominant forces of the government until recent times. These passages taken alone would give the impression that Mr. Smith is not so much a victim of the tendency of historians to carry back and attribute to the past experiences which belong only to the present as are our standard authors on the English constitution. Yet there are other passages which would indicate that he is a greater offender in this regard than even Bishop Stubbs or Doctor Freeman. This is especially manifest in his use of the word constitution. The statesmen of the Stuart century were the first to find any use for the word as applied to the English government. Mr. Smith not only follows Freeman and Stubbs in applying the word constitution to the early government, but he does what these authors seem to have been careful not to do; he so uses the word as to give the impression that it was in common use by the statesmen of the earlier centuries. A good illustration of this may be seen in the first volume, page 274. Mr. Smith is evidently following Bishop Stubbs in his account of the establishment of the protectorate of the Duke of York in 1454. He says: "The duke promised to exercise his authority in a constitutional manner, as chief of the royal council." The corresponding passage in Stubbs is:

The duke accepted the election with a protest that he undertook the task only in obedience to the king and the peerage of the land, in whom, by reason of the king's infirmity, "resteth the exercise of his authority." He requested farther the advice and assistance of the lords.

This description was sufficient to suggest the English constitution to the mind of Mr. Smith, and he thrusts in the word in such a way as to convey the erroneous impression that the Duke of York, more than four hundred years ago, expressly promised to rule in a "constitutional manner."

The book as it is is a useful and convenient compilation. As a compilation it would have been improved if the author had not undertaken at the same time to write a history of his own. He might have made it a good independent history had he boldly thrust forward his own work and made it possible to distinguish it from the work of others.

JESSE MACY.